as soon as an encroachment was made. What was worse, they started *poramoke* cases against individual ryots to gain their own ends. In many cases, the enquiry was started long after the encroachments were effected. The request of the people was that, until a correct and general re-survey was made, the Land Conservancy Regulation should not be rigorously worked against them, that, where clear cases of encroachments were detected, such areas should be registered in the names of the occupants if the lands were not required for purposes of Government, that, in the case of old encroachments, they should not be considered as serious offences on the part of the successors of those who made the encroachments and that the people should be given ample time and facilities for producing their evidence in *poramboke* enquiries.

In some cases, *porambokes* used to be detected in the middle of registered holdings. It was not clear how that was possible. Such *porambokes* should not be claimed by the Government but they should be invariably registered in the names of the occupants There should be special rules for the treatment of *poramboke* lands and the disposal of *poramboke* cases by which the interests of both the Government and the ryots might be safeguarded. In several instances, costly structures, dams, etc., were mercilessly pulled down on the alleged ground that they stood on *poramboke* lands. That, as well as the infliction of heavy fines on the successors of the original squatters, should be avoided. A re-survey might be considered too early. But the difficulties of the ryots were so great that even a re-survey was very desirable, as that alone would obviate the wilful harassment of the ryots by Government officials.

The Member next prayed that the *porambokes* on either side of the Kallada and Kulakkada rivers might be ordered to be registered in the names of the ryots, as in the case of the lands on the banks of the Neyyar and Killiar rivers.

Dewan.—If the lands on the banks of the Kallada and Kulakkada rivers, referred to by the Member, are similarly circumstanced as those on the banks of the Neyyar and Killiyar rivers, the question of extending to them the concessions granted to the latter will be favourably considered. The representation of the Member will be referred to the Peishkar for enquiry and report.

The Member, continuing, said that the method of levying *tharavila* was by no means uniform and that different rates not warranted by any rules were adopted in different places. He prayed that orders might be issued for the levy of reasonable rates of *tharavila* on a uniform basis.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

5. Reduction of *tharavila* on *puduval* lands.

Mr. C. Y. Ramakrishna Iyer (Member, T. I. C., Parur) said that the rates of *tharavila* now levied on *puduval* lands were a regular source of gain to the Government to the utter ruin of the ryots. The minimum *tharavila* usually charged on reclamations in the Parur taluk was at the rate of Rs. 7 per cent. Including the cost of conversion, a garden measuring one acre would cost from Rs. 3,000 to Rs 4,000. The applicant had to wait at least seven years for the trees to bear. Such reclamations under existing conditions were, therefore, not advantageous to the ryots because an acre of garden full of bearing trees could be had for sale at prices ranging from Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 2,000 according to yield and locality. Wet lands in the Parur taluk, known as *chelinilam*, were available for sale at the rate of Rs. 200 to Rs. 300 per acre. It was not, therefore, proper to fix twice or thrice that amount as *tharavila* in the case of reclamations. The Member prayed that Government be pleased to order the levy of only a nominal sum as *tharavila* for the registry of such lands.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly